

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/034,041	CONROY, JAMES J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Darren W. Ark	3643

All Participants:

(1) Darren W. Ark.

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final Action

(3) _____.

(2) William C. Collard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 November 2004

Time: 6:00pm EST

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of Non-Final Action mailed 6/17/04

Claims discussed:

15-20

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record, especially Pfeiffer, Sr. 1,286,763

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**DARREN W. ARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that claim 15 should be amended to recite the rows of protrusions such that they each comprise at least two protrusions similar to the manner in which Applicant had amended claim 18 in the Amendment filed 10/6/04. Examiner stated that with regard to claim 19, Pfeiffer Sr. discloses a base (Figs. 12, 13) with indentations (17b); a plurality of spacing elements wherein at least two of the rows of protrusions extending from the base in a substantially vertical manner (bottoms of 17b opposite the indentations, parts of 26 adjacent 29a & 31a, also right angle portions of 26 in Figs. 12, 13, also parts of 29 in Fig. 12, also 26a) in opposite directions from each other (some up and some down), and at least two rows of protrusions extending from the base in a substantially horizontal manner (fasteners in holes 28 in Figs. 12 & 13, laterally extending parts of 26 in Fig. 13, also 26a) in substantially opposite direction from each other (left and right). Examiner suggested amending claim 19 to have a similar limitation of the indentation extending between at least two of said plurality of rows of protrusions that is found in claims 18 and 20. Also, Examiner suggested canceling claim 17 since it is essentially claiming the same functional language as paragraph c) in claim 15 and is therefore redundant. Applicant agreed to the proposed Examiner's Amendment. (Please see Examiner's Amendment for details).